Introduction
Xenophon the Athenian

This book seeks to understand Xenophon as an elite Athenian writing largely for an elite Athenian audience in the first half of the fourth century BC. Xenophon was an exceptional member of the Athenian elite in many respects: as a Socratic, mercenary general, and longtime exile from his city. Nonetheless, his diverse and extensive corpus deeply reflects his elite Athenian identity and addresses matters of great importance to his Athenian readers. Central among these is the question of the proper political role of members of the elite within the Athenian democracy especially in the aftermath of the brutal oligarchy of 404/3 that many members of the city's elite had supported. Close consideration of Xenophon's treatment of this can help us to understand better not only his personal perspective but also the challenges, both practical and ideological, faced by his contemporary elite Athenian audience.

The Xenophon who emerges in the course of this study is a social and political innovator, who calls on men of his own class to set aside their assumptions of superiority based on birth or wealth and to reinvent themselves as individuals who can provide effective leadership to the democratic city and serve it as good citizens. Xenophon has too often been viewed as a traditional aristocrat who rejects democratic rule and promotes an aristocratic worldview that is at odds with it. This vision of Xenophon, however, is not borne out by a careful reading of his writings. Xenophon, in fact, calls on his contemporary elite audience to adapt and contribute to the democratic city, and insists that this will benefit both them and the city. Far from encouraging complacency among Athenians of his class, Xenophon – and the Socrates he depicts in several of his works – challenges, criticizes, and sometimes satirizes the Athenian elite and their attitudes, and seeks to instruct them concerning the values, knowledge, and practical skills they will need to succeed as civic leaders. Xenophon is best understood not as an aristocratic dinosaur who is out of place in a democratic setting but as a thoughtful and pragmatic reformist who seeks

to ensure that meritorious members of the elite step forward to lead within the democracy.

Although Xenophon's communications with his elite Athenian readers are necessarily one-sided from our modern vantage point – we have only his words and do not know how members of the Athenian elite responded to these – there is good reason to believe that his writings addressed matters of considerable interest to this audience. This is evident not only when Xenophon treats elite pastimes, such as hunting and horsemanship, or estate management, but also when he expounds on the role of the elite in political life. Elite Athenians were disproportionately active in leadership roles in the democratic city, and how they carried these out mattered immensely to them and the city. While one would be hard-pressed to write a history of Athens' elite exclusively on the basis of Xenophon's writings, these can enrich our understanding of the constraints on, and opportunities for, the elite under the democracy.[1]

In exploring Xenophon's relationship with his elite Athenian audience, this book aims to offer a fresh perspective on his eclectic writings. Scholars have productively investigated many aspects of Xenophon's corpus, including his forays into philosophical, literary, and historical discourse; his striking generic innovation; his portrayal of Socrates and the relation of this to Plato's depiction of him; and his delineation of the principles of good leadership in diverse settings.[2] Although these inquiries have illuminated important features of Xenophon's writings, they tend not to engage with a significant facet of it, namely, that Xenophon is an Athenian writer addressing to a large extent an elite Athenian reading audience and that this context has important implications for our understanding of his perspective and purposes, and the reception of these by his contemporaries. While no one would dispute Xenophon's Athenian origins and many would probably acknowledge that his audience was largely Athenian, relatively few scholars have sought to make sense of his writings in this

[1] For a good overview of what "elite" means in an Athenian context and the attributes associated with the city's elite, see Ober 1989: 11–13. In economic terms, elite Athenians could be described as those individuals who carried out liturgies for the city and paid the irregularly imposed war tax (*eisphora*), that is, the wealthiest 5 percent or so of adult male citizens: see Christ 2006: 154–5.

[2] Several useful collections of essays illustrate how scholars have diversely explored Xenophon's writings in recent years: Tuplin 2004; Hobden and Tuplin 2012; Flower 2017a; Danzig, Johnson, and Morrison 2018. Gray 2010 collects some influential essays from 1966 to 2004. On Xenophon's view of ideal leadership, see Gray 2007: 3–14, 2011b; Flower 2016, 2017b: 6; Buxton 2017; Ferrario 2017: 74–9; Marincola 2017: 108–12. Most scholars now take Xenophon seriously as a writer and thinker, and would reject the assessment of Anderson (1974: 45; cf. Kelly 1996: 163) that "one cannot claim for Xenophon any profound moral or political insights."

context. This study seeks to fill this gap and to offer a framework for understanding the significant portion of Xenophon's corpus that bears substantially on Athens and Athenian concerns.

To read Xenophon within his cultural context, it is important first to appreciate his Athenian roots and affinities and the likelihood that he wrote largely for an Athenian audience. Although the details of Xenophon's biography are sketchy, he was born around 430 in Athens to a wealthy family; as a young man he studied with Socrates; and he likely served in the Athenian cavalry and as a member of it may well have supported the oligarchic regime of the Thirty in 404/3. His affiliation with the Thirty may have influenced his decision, after their expulsion, to join Cyrus and the large band of Greek mercenaries under him in 401 for what turned out to be a two-year march into the heart of the Persian Empire and back out again. Xenophon subsequently served as a mercenary in Asia Minor under a series of Spartan commanders, including eventually Agesilaus, with whom he returned to the Greek mainland and apparently fought in the Battle of Coronea in 394 against an allied force that included Athenians. This last action may be what led the Athenians to exile him, if they had not done so earlier due to his support of Cyrus or of Spartan military ventures in Asia Minor. As an exile Xenophon lived at Scillus near Olympia under the protection of the Spartans until their defeat at Leuctra in 371 and then at Corinth. Although Xenophon's exile is said to have been rescinded at some point, he may not have taken up residence in Athens again; his two sons, however, fought on the Athenian side at the Battle of Mantinea in 362, where one of them, Gryllus, died as cavalryman. Xenophon was still writing after the Social War of 357–355 (*Vect.* 4.40; cf. 5.9), but we do not know how much longer he lived after this.[3]

Even though he was an exile for much of his adult life – and perhaps especially because of this – Xenophon's Athenian experience and identity shapes his literary corpus.[4] This is most conspicuous in his Socratic works, which are all set in Athens (*Apology*, *Memorabilia*, *Oeconomicus*, and *Symposium*); his *Hellenica*, whose first two books focus on Athens; and his

[3] On Xenophon's life and career, see Flower 2012: 19–27, with earlier bibliography and the ancient testimonia, including most importantly Diogenes Laertius 2.48–59, which cites many earlier authors; cf. Lee 2017. Gray (2007: 18 n. 31) challenges the common assumption that Xenophon served in the cavalry under the Thirty. For the debate concerning the details of Xenophon's exile, see Tuplin 1987; Green 1994; and Badian 2004: 40–2. Dillery (2006: 60–2, 66–7) rightly notes that the evidence is slippery.

[4] For a survey of explicit mentions of Athens in Xenophon's works, see Tuplin 2017: 339–46. In my view, Tuplin underestimates the impact of Xenophon's Athenian experience and identity on his writings.

treatises *Hipparchicus* (*On the Cavalry Commander*) and *Poroi* (*Ways and Means*), both of which offer practical advice to the Athenians.[5] Arguably, however, even when Athens is not explicitly at the center of his writing, Xenophon's interests as an elite Athenian determine the topics he takes up and how he treats them. For example, his *Constitution of the Lacedaemonians* reflects a long-standing fascination among elite Athenians with Sparta as an alternative to Athens.[6] And Xenophon's enduring interest in aristocrats in various guises across space and time – Cyrus the Great in *Cyropaedia*, and the title characters in *Hiero* and *Agesilaus* – can be read as, among other things, a projection and exploration of elite Athenian identity.

There are numerous indications, moreover, that Xenophon views himself as an active participant in Athens' literary culture.[7] For example, it seems that he wrote his *Apology* and *Symposium* in direct response to those of Plato and as part of his rivalry with him over Socrates' legacy, to which his other Socratic works also attest (cf. D. L. 2.57, 3.34–5).[8] Furthermore, in his *Peri Hippikēs* (*On Horsemanship*), Xenophon explicitly acknowledges that an Athenian, Simon, has written expertly on the subject, but nonetheless offers his own treatise as a useful complement to this (1.1; cf. 11.6). On a much larger scale, his *Hellenica* manifestly seeks to continue Thucydides' *Histories* by picking up the history of the Peloponnesian War where Thucydides left off and giving an account of Greek history down to 362. And when Xenophon launches an attack on contemporary sophists in his treatise

[5] Xenophon may also have written *Peri Hippikēs* (*On Horsemanship*) especially with an Athenian audience in mind since he speaks of it (12.14) as a sort of sequel to *Hipparchicus*, which is explicitly addressed to Athenians, and as a complement to the writings of the Athenian Simon (1.1). Delebecque (1978: 9–10) argues that *On Horsemanship* is not addressed to an Athenian audience, but the evidence that he cites for this is not compelling.

[6] Although Xenophon idealizes early Sparta in this treatise (pace Humble 2004), he criticizes contemporary Sparta for its moral decline (*Lac. Pol.* 14); on the complexity of Xenophon's view of Sparta, see Tuplin 1994: 163. On philolaconism among Athens' elite, see Carter 1986: 71–5. For Xenophon's manifest interest in Sparta as an alternative to Athens, see *Mem.* 3.5.15–17; Tuplin (2017: 340) too quickly rejects the possibility that Xenophon comes at Sparta in the *Constitution of the Lacedaemonians* "from an Athenian angle."

[7] That Xenophon views himself as participating specifically in a literary culture is reflected in the fact that he frequently refers to the written nature of his work: see *Mem.* 1.3.1; *An.* 2.3.1, 2.6.4; *Eq.* 3.1, 8.2, 9.1, 9.12, 10.17, 12.14; *Eq. Mag.* 5.4, 5.9, 9.1; *Lac. Pol.* 12.7; *Cyn.* 13.7. Pomeroy (1994: 10) underestimates Xenophon's engagement with Athenian literary culture in allowing only that "he probably read some current Athenian literature."

[8] Although some scholars argue that Xenophon's *Symposium* came first (see Thesleff 1978 and Danzig 2005), most believe this is not the case (see Huss 1999: 13–18). The rivalry between Xenophon and Plato may also manifest itself elsewhere, for example, Aulus Gellius (14.3.3) claims that Xenophon began to write his *Cyropaedia* after the first two books of Plato's *Republic* came out (cf. D. L. 3.34); in any event, Plato may well be responding dismissively to the *Cyropaedia* at *Laws* 694c, as D. L. 3.34 and Ath. 11.504e–505a posit (see Danzig 2003b and Flower 2012: 28). On Xenophon's rivalry with Plato as a Socratic, see Waterfield 2004, with earlier bibliography.

Cynegeticus (*On Hunting*) and distinguishes his own approach and values from theirs (13.1–7),[9] he is likely alluding to sophists in contemporary Athens;[10] this polemic both sets Xenophon apart from one group of participants in Athenian literary culture (he specifically criticizes their "writings": 13.1–3) and puts him in the company of "the philosophers" with whom he contrasts the sophists (13.6, 9; cf. *Vect.* 5.4) – this group would presumably include Plato and Isocrates, who also lambaste sophists in their works (cf. 13.6).[11] The tradition that Isocrates wrote an encomium of Xenophon's son Gryllus after his death at Mantinea (Hermippus fr. 52 Wehrli *apud* D. L. 2.55), if based in fact, may reflect recognition of Xenophon's membership in Athens' literary community as much as any personal connection between him and Isocrates.[12] Although Xenophon, as a longtime exile from his city, could not participate directly in the life of the city, his literary works allowed him to do so from a distance.

The substantial orientation of Xenophon's corpus toward Athenian topics and concerns and his self-conscious participation in Athenian literary culture suggest that Xenophon was writing especially with an Athenian audience in mind. This is not to say that literate Greeks elsewhere could not have read and enjoyed Xenophon; they presumably did. But Athens, given its size, prosperity, and thriving literary culture, probably had the largest reading audience in the Greek world at this time, and the Athenian orientation of many of Xenophon's works made them especially appropriate for this audience.[13] This readership would have consisted primarily of elite Athenians, who had sufficient wealth and leisure to attain a high level of literacy through their education, could afford to purchase books, and

[9] Gray (1985) makes a strong case that *Cynegeticus* is an authentic Xenophontic work, pace Classen 1984: 154. Xenophon is not uniformly hostile to sophists in his writings: see Dorion 2017: 41–5. As Dillery (2017: 215–16; cf. L'Allier 2012) observes, Xenophon at times deploys sophistic language in his critique of sophists in *Cynegeticus*.

[10] Cf. Tuplin 2017: 340–1.

[11] Pace Thomas (2018: 631–7), who argues that Xenophon's polemic targets Plato. On Xenophon, Plato, and Isocrates, see Tuplin 2017: 346–8. Xenophon not only links himself to philosophers in this diatribe, but also associates himself with Thucydides when he speaks of the utility and importance of his work for future generations (13.7; cf. Thuc. 1.22.4).

[12] Cf. Flower 2012: 26. Although Azoulay (2004a: 296) views this encomium as evidence of cordial relations between Isocrates and Xenophon, who were fellow demesmen, Xenophon's literary stature may have been the impetus for it. According to Diogenes Laertius (2.55), "Aristotle says that there were innumerable authors of eulogies and epitaphs for Gryllus, who wrote in part at least to gratify his father" (fr. 68 Rose); Pausanias (1.3.4, 8.11.6, 9.15.5) reports that there was a painting of Gryllus wounding Epaminondas in the Stoa of Zeus Eleutherios in Athens.

[13] Flower (2012: 44; cf. Due 1989: 234; Pomeroy 1994: 9) is more cautious on the question of Xenophon's audience: "This surely included his fellow Athenians as well as Greeks from other cities."

may have congregated with men of their class in social settings for reading aloud from them.[14] The fourth century witnessed a surge in the production and presumably also in the reading of prose works in Athens, including philosophical, oratorical, and historical texts.[15] Although elite Athenian readers no doubt differed in their tastes, Xenophon's corpus may have held particularly wide appeal among them since it was diverse and accessible and it focused on activities – including hunting, horsemanship, estate management, and political and military leadership – that were of broad interest to upper-class Athenians and central to their personal and collective identities.[16]

Two further features of Xenophon's writings may have broadened their appeal among elite Athenians: their moderate perspective on the Athenian democracy, with which the city's elite seem to have made their peace for the most part by the early fourth century, and their extensive attention to how elite Athenians can succeed within a democratic polity. Although many scholars have viewed Xenophon as a conservative aristocrat and oligarch who opposed the Athenian democracy,[17] recent scholarship has challenged this assessment, arguing that while Xenophon is sometimes critical of the democracy, he is restrained in his criticism.[18] Particularly telling is his depiction of Athens in the opening books of his *Hellenica*: although Xenophon's portrayal of the Athenian people (*dēmos*) in the Arginusae affair is critical (1.7.12–15), his depiction of the oligarchic junta of the Thirty is scathing (2.3–4), and his admiration of the Amnesty of 403, which the *dēmos* passed at the conclusion of the Athenian civil war (2.4.43), suggests that in his view the democracy proved itself to be

[14] On the nexus of wealth and literacy in Athens, see Harris 1989: 65–115; on reading as a marker of elite status and culture in classical antiquity, see Johnson 2000: 612–25. On the expense of books in Athens, see Harris 1989: 94–5. On "reading circles" in Athens, see Kelly 1996; Johnson 2000: 617–18; Thomas 2003: 172; on the communal character of reading in Greece and Rome, see Johnson 2000 and 2012.

[15] On the growth of book culture in fourth-century Athens, see Harris 1989: 84–8; Knox 1989: 161–8; Morgan 1999: 58–9; Kurke 2000; Thomas 2003: 170, 183; Pinto 2013. Xenophon himself provides a glimpse of a flourishing book culture in Athens in his satirical portrayal of Euthydemos as book collector (see *Mem.* 4.2.1, with Pinto 2013: 90) and perhaps of the inter-*polis* book trade in his description of "many books" washed up from a shipwreck on the Black Sea coast (*An.* 7.5.14).

[16] Waterfield (2004: 81–5) proposes that Xenophon, in his Socratic corpus, is engaged in popularizing philosophy. On the potentially wide appeal of Xenophon and Isocrates in the "moral education" of the elite, see Pownall 2006.

[17] See Luccioni 1947: 136–8; Anderson 1974: 40; Waterfield and Cartledge 1997: ix; Hunt 1998: 144–5; Pownall 2000: 511, 2003: 110–12; Brock 2004: 253–4; Tamiolaki 2013: 48–50; cf. Bevilacqua 2018: 470, 477. Kroeker (2009: 198–9) provides a useful survey of scholarship on Xenophon's political perspective.

[18] See Waterfield 2004: 104–7; Kroeker 2009; Gray 2011a; Tuplin 2017: 349–58; cf. Seager 2001: 387, 392–4; Badian 2004: 49–52; McCloskey 2017.

superior to the oligarchy of the Thirty.[19] In keeping with Xenophon's own moderate perspective on the democracy is his admiring portrayal of Socrates, who objects to the democratic use of sortition (*Mem.* 1.2.9–11) and has some unkind words about the average men who participate in the Athenian Assembly (3.7.5), but is nonetheless, "one of the people and a friend of mankind" (*dēmotikos kai philanthropos*, 1.2.60).[20] On balance, it seems right to view Xenophon as an "immanent" or "internal" critic of the democracy, who seeks to improve rather than overthrow it, and not as a "rejectionist" or "external" critic of it.[21]

For Xenophon – and arguably for most members of his elite Athenian reading audience – the pressing question is not how the elite can alter the city's democratic constitution, but rather how they can succeed under it, and Xenophon addresses this at great length and in a variety of ways in his writings. The city's elite played a significant role in providing leadership, especially as orators (*rhētores*) and generals, under the democracy; this was vital for the success of the democracy and an important way for elite Athenians to win honor and prestige, and the social and political advantages that attended these.[22] Xenophon, as we shall see, offers his elite Athenian readers an education in the values, knowledge, and skills that they will need to lead the democracy effectively.

A striking feature of Xenophon's communications with his elite Athenian readership is his rejection of the arrogant assumption that men of the upper class deserve to lead within the city because of their wealth or high birth. Xenophon insists that the city's elite are not automatically qualified to lead but must seek out an education that will make them worthy of leading – a traditional aristocratic education does not suffice for this.[23]

[19] See Gray 2007: 17–18, 2011a: 28–9, and Kroeker 2009: 222–4. Chapter 1 examines in detail Xenophon's treatment of these episodes.

[20] On the sortition passage, see Gray 2011a: 14–16; on the Assembly passage, see ibid. 20–3 and Kroeker 2009: 214–15. Gray (2011a: 5–7, 23–8; cf. Kroeker 2009: 207–16) makes a strong case against earlier scholars, including Luccioni 1947: 108–38 and Vlastos 1983: 502–8, that Xenophon portrays Socrates as "democratic in the broadest sense" (6), and posits that "Xenophon's own attitudes to democracy are even more democratic than those of his Socrates" (28).

[21] For the categorization of political criticism in these terms, see Walzer 1987, 1988. Ober (1998: 48–51) productively applies Walzer's terminology to the analysis of Athenian critics of popular rule, but does not treat Xenophon in his study. Kroeker (2009: 200–2), building on Ober, draws on this terminology in his assessment of Xenophon's political stance, arguing (226; cf. 202–6) that although Xenophon "tended strongly towards an internal/immanent critique, his *Lac.* exhibits a decidedly external/rejectionist stance"; Gray (2011a: 2–3), however, makes a good case that this work need not be viewed as rejectionist.

[22] On the substantial role of the elite in the city's political life, see Ober 1989: 84–93, and passim, and Hansen 1991: 266–77.

[23] On education as an elite marker and source of elite pride, see Ober 1989: 11–13, 156–91.

In so doing, they must actively transform themselves and revise their understanding of what it means to be a gentleman (*kalos kagathos*). Rather than reinforce elite notions of superiority, privilege, and entitlement, Xenophon exposes their absurdity. If Xenophon is in some sense an "immanent" critic of the Athenian democracy, he is more conspicuously an "immanent" critic of men of his own class, as he takes the city's elite to task for their failure to fulfill the roles they should within the city, and offers often pointed advice on how they can lead responsibly.[24] While this entails deflating elite egos, Xenophon suggests that those who embrace this vision can take control of themselves and their circumstances and achieve prominence in the city. Empowerment of this sort, however, demands first humility and self-knowledge, and a willingness to learn from those who have a superior understanding of good leadership and its underpinnings, like Xenophon and his Socrates.[25]

Although scholars have tended not to explore in detail Xenophon's relationship with his elite Athenian audience and the nature of his communications with them, there are some notable exceptions. Steven Johnstone (1994), for example, proposes that Xenophon formulates for his elite readers a vision of "aristocratic style" to which only they have access through the elite lifestyle and culture that he sets forth as a model for them. In my view, although Johnstone is right to posit that Xenophon engages with the problem of elite identity, he is mistaken in his assessment of Xenophon's perspective and intent. Xenophon is not concerned so much with "aristocratic style" – even broadly conceived – as with educating his readers in the values, knowledge, and skills they need to lead the democracy responsibly; and he is not a defender of class interests who seeks merely to defend and preserve elite prerogatives and power, but a critic of elite arrogance who insists that members of the elite must substantially transform themselves to be worthy of leading democratic Athens.[26]

[24] Cf. Ferrario 2017: 74: "his generally pro-aristocratic perspective tends often to manifest itself in a call to class-appropriate political and social responsibility."

[25] This reading of Xenophon as an author who accepts the legitimacy of the Athenian democracy and seeks to communicate openly and directly to a broad elite audience how they can succeed within it diverges radically from that of Leo Strauss, who envisions Xenophon as an opponent of the democracy who conveys his views cryptically to an elite philosophical few. In general, elite writers in Athens were free to communicate as they saw fit with their reading audiences under the democracy and had no need to conceal their real intent from their readers (see Ober 1998: 43–8, 156–7); and Xenophon's program for reforming the city's elite is hardly veiled from his reader, as he develops it in detail and openly across much of his corpus. For criticism of Strauss' approach to Xenophon, see Dorion 2010: 283–93, 320–3; cf. Gray 2011b: 54–67; Rood 2015; Flower 2017b: 7–8. Johnson (2012: 123–31, 156–7) offers a more positive appraisal of the Straussian approach.

[26] For further discussion of Johnstone's position, see Chapter 3.

In advancing this perspective on Xenophon's "message" for his elite Athenian audience, I build on Ryan Balot's (2001) perceptive analysis of this. Balot rejects Johnstone's vision of Xenophon as "elaborating a certain model of aristocratic 'style': a style of life to which only the wealthy have access," and argues that "Xenophon's rehabilitation of aristocratic worth proceeds primarily on the basis of claims about aristocratic civic value and moral character" (233).[27] In my view, Balot is right to point to Xenophon's deep concern with moral excellence among the elite and to emphasize that "Xenophon is concerned to educate the upper classes to become responsible and effective leaders" (233).[28] I do not believe, however, that Xenophon's project entails a "rehabilitation of aristocratic worth" and a "reinvention of the aristocratic political ideal" (232). Although Xenophon is conscious of class difference and addresses his elite peers in terms that are meaningful to them, in my view he is not promoting specifically *aristocratic* worth or an *aristocratic* political ideal that would differentiate members of the elite from other citizens. Rather, he urges members of the elite to embrace basic values that are not class specific and to apply these in serving the democratic city responsibly. He seeks more to integrate the elite within the city than to differentiate them from their fellow citizens on the basis of shared values or political ideology. In Xenophon's view, while elite Athenians enjoy many advantages – not least access to education (cf. *Cyr.* 1.2.15) – and this means members of the elite are more likely than average citizens to play leadership roles in the city, they are bound to other citizens by common interests and goals as members of a civic community. Although Xenophon in my view stops well short of expressing, as Ron Kroeker (2009) suggests, "a solidarity with the foundational ideology of the democratic regime,"[29] he offers pragmatic advice to the city's elite concerning how they can improve their own situation, along with that of their fellow citizens, by providing effective leadership within the democracy.[30]

[27] Balot (2001: 229–31) speaks of the need for "rehabilitation" and "reinvention" in the context of the calamitous rule of the Thirty that undercut elite claims to innate virtue and political superiority.

[28] It is important to note, however, that while Xenophon is deeply concerned with the moral excellence of the elite, as Balot posits, he is equally concerned that elite citizens acquire the knowledge and practical skills that they need to lead well, and this sets him apart from other elite writers.

[29] Kroeker (2009: 197 [abstract]; cf. 227–8) posits: "his works seem to express a sympathy for the democracy that extends beyond a patriotic desire for the betterment of his native city regardless of constitution to a solidarity with the foundational ideology of the democratic regime."

[30] Seager (2001: 387; cf. 392–4) rightly observes that Xenophon "makes greater allowance for the claims of the individual, his reputation, family, and friends, than is customary in democratic discourse."

In the analysis that follows, I focus on the works of Xenophon that best illuminate his Athenian interests and his engagement with his elite Athenian audience. Although this means that most of the chapters are devoted to works that have a manifest link to Athens, a chapter on the *Anabasis* proposes that it is shaped much more by Athenian concerns and interests than has been recognized and that it brings together many features of Xenophon's explicitly Athenian reflections.

Although each chapter of this study treats a different Xenophontic work (and in the case of one chapter, two works), the sequence of chapters is determined by my argument rather than the order in which the works may have been written. Some Xenophontic works or parts of these can be fairly securely dated,[31] but we are not in a position to assert with confidence the sequence of each work within Xenophon's literary production. This is unfortunate since it would be interesting to track the evolution of Xenophon's thinking and its relation to what we know, or think we know, of his career and experiences. Nonetheless, while we cannot discern how Xenophon's thought developed over time, we can still identify persistent concerns and the different ways in which Xenophon addresses these across his corpus.[32]

Indeed, a primary objective of this study is to demonstrate that Xenophon advances a fairly coherent and consistent vision of how elite Athenians should live their lives within the democracy and provide leadership to it across a range of generically diverse works that were presumably composed at different times. My approach, which could be described as holistic and synthetic, is to seek out continuities across works that on the face of it are sometimes quite different from one another so as to illuminate Xenophon's educational agenda and political perspective. To be sure, Xenophon is not always entirely consistent, but I believe that we can better understand Xenophon's thinking and objectives by identifying and analyzing the significant threads that connect his works to one another. In my view, Xenophon's Athenian works have too often been viewed in isolation from one another, and this has been an obstacle to understanding each of them individually and the larger corpus of which they are a part.

Xenophon's profound interest in the proper role of the elite within the Athenian democracy is perhaps not surprising for a thoughtful man of his

[31] For a pithy summary of "a few secure points" in dating Xenophontic works, see Lee 2017: 33–4.
[32] Cf. Flower 2017b: 9: "It might be better, therefore, to lay aside the question of chronology, and concentrate on the construction of meaning across the corpus."